



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,613	11/09/2001	Tomoya Sato	03863.0053	5966

7590 07/03/2003

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

WALLENHORST, MAUREEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1743

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/986,613

Applicant(s)

SATO, TOMOYA

Examiner

Maureen M. Wallenhorst

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-18,25-30,32 and 34-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19-24,31 and 33 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1743

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

2. Claims 1, 3-8, 17-33 and 52-53 are objected to because of the following informalities:

On line 5 of claim 1 after the phrase “at least two wave numbers”, it is suggested to insert the phrase --, wherein said at least two wave numbers are--. On line 6 of claim 1, it is suggested to insert the phrase --within said specific region-- after the word “virus”. On lines 7-8 of claim 1, it is suggested to delete the phrase “within said specific region in accordance with the results of said spectral analysis—in order to provide further clarification in claim 1. These same changes are also suggested for claims 8, 52 and 53. On line 1 of claim 17, the phrase --at least two— should be inserted before the phrase “wave numbers” in order to be consistent with the terminology used in claim 1. This same change should also be made on line 2 of claim 19, line 2 of claim 20, line 2 of claim 22, line 2 of claim 24, line 1 of claim 26, line 1 of claim 29, line 2 of claim 31 and line 2 of claim 33. On line 1 of claim 18, the phrase “the other” should be changed to --another of the at least two--. On line 3 of claim 18, the phrase “selected from” should be changed to --selected from the group consisting of—so as to use proper Markush language. These same types of changes should also be made in claims 19, 24, 30, 31, 52 and 53. On line 2 of claim 21, the word “measured” should be deleted for additional clarification. This same change should also be made in claim 23. Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claims 9-16, 34-51 and 54-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1743

Claims 9-16, 34-51 and 54-55 are indefinite since it is not clear what the appearance of the spectra at the at least two wave numbers serves to indicate about the drug. In other words, it is not clear how the appearance of spectra corresponding to wave numbers obtained by measuring an absorption or emission spectrum of cancer cells, bacteria or virus relates to the screening of a drug. How can the absorption or emission spectrum from a cancer cell, bacteria or virus indicate a property of a target drug?

On line 4 of claim 9 after the phrase “at least two wave numbers”, it is suggested to insert the phrase --, wherein said at least two wave numbers are--. On line 5 of claim 9, it is suggested to insert the phrase --within said specific region-- after the word “virus”. On lines 6-7 of claim 9, it is suggested to delete the phrase “within said specific region in accordance with the results of said spectral analysis—in order to provide further clarification in claim 9. These same changes are also suggested in claims 16, 54 and 55.

On lines 1-2 of claim 12, it is suggested to change the phrase “the wave number” to --one of the at least two wave numbers—so as to be consistent with the terminology used in claim 9. On line 2 of claim 12, the phrase “at least one of” should be deleted, and the word “and” changed to --or--.

On line 2 of claim 34, the phrase --at least two—should be inserted before the phrase “wave numbers” in order to be consistent with the terminology used in claim 9. This same change should also be made in claims 36, 37, 39, 41, 44, 48, 50 and 51.

On line 1 of claim 35, the phrase “the other” should be changed to --another of the at least two--. On line 3 of claim 35, the phrase “selected from” should be changed to --selected from the group consisting of--. These same changes should also be made in claims 36, 41, 49 and 50.

Art Unit: 1743

On line 2 of claim 38, the word “measured” should be deleted for additional clarification. This same change should also be made in claim 40.

In claim 43, the phrase “said specimen” lacks antecedent basis.

In claims 45 and 47, the phrase “said cells” lacks antecedent basis.

On line 7 of claim 54, the phrase “said spectral analysis is an infrared spectral analysis” should be changed to –said specific region is an infrared region—for further clarification. This same change should also be made on line 9 of claim 55.

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3, 8 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cohenford et al (WO 97/18566, submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on Jan. 4, 2002).

Cohenford et al teach of a method to identify cellular abnormalities in cells, which are associated with disease states such as premalignant and malignant stages of cervical cancer. In the method, the infrared absorption spectrum of a dried sample of cells on a transparent matrix is obtained in the specific region from 3000-950 cm^{-1} . The identification of a sample as in a disease state, i.e. cancerous, is based upon a comparison of the spectrum obtained with the test sample to representative spectra of normal, dysplastic and malignant specimens. Variations in the absorption spectrum of the test sample at at least one range of frequencies in the range measured (3000-950 cm^{-1}) are detected, and the presence of the variations is indicative of a

Art Unit: 1743

premalignant or malignant condition. Variations at two or more wave numbers within the range of frequencies measured are detected, i.e. variations in the regions of $1250\text{-}1000\text{ cm}^{-1}$, $1420\text{-}1330\text{ cm}^{-1}$ and $3000\text{-}2800\text{ cm}^{-1}$. See page 15, lines 5-9 and page 18, lines 7-11 of Cohenford et al.

Therefore, Cohenford et al teach of a method for determining a disease (i.e. cancer) in a sample of cells by analyzing the absorption or emission spectrum of the sample in a specific region (i.e. $3000\text{-}950\text{ cm}^{-1}$), and determining the disease type or state by using as indices the appearance of spectra (i.e. variations) corresponding to at least two wave numbers ($1250\text{-}1000\text{ cm}^{-1}$, $1420\text{-}1330\text{ cm}^{-1}$ and $3000\text{-}2800\text{ cm}^{-1}$) within the specific region.

6. Claims 1-3, 8 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oong et al.

Oong et al teach of a method for detecting abnormalities in cells using infrared spectroscopy. A beam of infrared light is directed at a test specimen of cells so as to measure an absorption or emission spectrum in a certain region. An abnormality of the cells such as cancer is detected by spectral analysis of the infrared absorption spectrum of the sample at at least one range of frequencies to ascertain whether at least one change in the infrared absorption characteristics has occurred, which is characteristic of the abnormality. The change in the infrared absorption characteristic can be a change in absorption intensity at a particular frequency. For example, Oong et al teach that changes in absorption intensity between normal cell samples and malignant cell samples occur at frequencies/wave numbers of 1025, 1047, 1082, 1155, 1244 and 1303 cm^{-1} . See Figure 2 and lines 42-57 in column 4 of Oong et al. Therefore, Oong et al teach of using the appearance of spectra corresponding to at least two wave numbers within the region measured as indices of disease (i.e. malignancy) for a tested specimen of cells.

Art Unit: 1743

7. Claims 1-3, 8 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wong et al.

Wong et al teach of a method for detecting anomalies in biological cells using infrared spectroscopy. A beam of infrared light is directed at a sample of cells, and the anomaly is detected at at least one range of frequencies by determining whether changes in infrared absorption have occurred due to the vibration of at least one functional group of molecules present in the sample, which is characteristic of the anomaly. Wong et al teach that the infrared spectra from control and cancerous cell samples in the frequency ranges of 1300-1800 cm^{-1} and 2800-3050 cm^{-1} are compared to the same ranges of absorption in the test sample. Wong et al teach that spectral changes occur between healthy and cancerous cells at frequencies or wave numbers of around 1082, 1170, 1230, 1380, 1713, 2850 and 2960 cm^{-1} . See lines 23-30 in column 4 of Wong et al. Therefore, Wong et al teach of using the appearance of spectra corresponding to at least two wave numbers within the region measured as indices of disease (i.e. cancer) for a tested specimen of cells.

8. Claims 1-3, 7-8, 25 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zakim et al.

Zakim et al teach of a method for the diagnosis of disease by infrared analysis of cells. The method comprises the steps of measuring a first spectra in a predetermined frequency range for cells that are free of dysplasia, measuring a second spectra in the same predetermined frequency range for a test sample of cells, comparing the first and second spectra for variations in frequency bands for indicating dysplasia and diagnosing a level of dysplasia based on the number and magnitude of variations between the first and second spectra. The predetermined

Art Unit: 1743

frequency range in which measurements are made is between 600-4000 cm^{-1} . According to Fig. 9 in Zakim et al, differences in the spectra between normal cells and dysplastic cells occur at the frequencies or wave numbers of 1025, 1040 and 1050-1054 cm^{-1} . See lines 14-18 in column 16 of Zakim et al. According to Fig 11, lines 24-43 of column 17 and lines 1-11 of column 18, differences in the spectra between normal cells, dysplastic cells and cells infected with HPV virus occur at 970, 1000 and 1100 cm^{-1} . Therefore, Zakim et al teach of using the appearance of spectra corresponding to at least two wave numbers within the region measured as indices of disease or virus infection for a tested specimen of cells.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. Claims 1, 3-12, 16-18, 25-30, 32, 34-35, 42-49 and 52-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 285296 (submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed Jan. 4, 2002) in view of any one of Cohenford et al, Oong et al or Wong et al. For a

Art Unit: 1743

teaching of Cohenford et al, Oong et al and Wong et al, see previous paragraphs in this Office action.

JP 285296 ('296) teaches of a method and apparatus for judging a transformed state of bioactivity in substances such as cells by performing spectral analysis in a specific region of bioactivity of the cells to obtain a characteristic spectrum indicating a characteristic of the transformed bioactivity. A transformed state of the cells is determined depending upon an appearance state of the spectrum. The apparatus comprises an irradiating section 4 for irradiating cells with quantum energy, a detecting section 6 for detecting a spectrum of bioactivity, and an operational processing section 8, which analyzes the spectrum to obtain the detected spectrum in a specific range of frequencies as a characteristic spectrum indicating a characteristic of the transformed bioactivity. The spectrum of the cells is compared to the spectrum which is characteristic of a transformed state of bioactivity in order to diagnose the transformed state in the cells themselves. Spectral analysis is performed on both normal and cancerous cells. Characteristic spectra are always observed in malignant cells, but not in normal cells. JP '296 teaches that one example of a characteristic spectrum in the infrared range for a malignant cell is 1261.4 cm^{-1} . Therefore, at this wave number, the spectra differ between normal and cancerous cells. With the characteristic spectrum of malignant cells, it is possible to judge whether or not normal cells have been transformed into malignant cells by comparing the spectra of the normal cells to the spectra of the malignant cells at certain defined wave numbers, i.e. 1261.4 cm^{-1} . JP '296 teaches that either the measurement of an absorption or an emission spectrum can be measured and compared between a normal and a cancerous cell sample. JP '296 teaches that it is possible to judge the transformed states of cells, bacteria, viruses, anti-

Art Unit: 1743

cancer agents, etc. JP'296 fails to teach that the comparison of spectra between normal and malignant cells can be performed at more than one frequency or wave number.

However, based upon a combination of JP '296 and either Cohenford et al, Oong et al or Wong et al, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to compare the spectra taught by JP '296 between normal and malignant cells at more than one frequency or wave number (i.e. other than 1261.4 cm^{-1}) since any one of Cohenford et al, Oong et al and Wong et al disclose that the infrared absorption spectra between normal cells and diseased cells differs from one another at multiple frequencies or wave numbers, thus giving multiple indications that a test sample of cells is either malignant or normal. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine another wave number, such as those recited in the instant claims, to compare between normal and diseased specimens analyzed with the method taught by JP '296 in addition to 1261.4 cm^{-1} since all of Cohenford et al, Oong et al and Wong et al disclose multiple other wave numbers at which normal and diseased specimens differ, and routine experimentation can be used to observe the wave numbers where differences occur.

12. Claims 9-11, 13-16, 42-43, 45-47 and 54-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 286740 (submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed Jan. 4, 2002) in view of any one of Cohenford et al. Oong et al or Wong et al. For a teaching of Cohenford et al, Oong et al and Wong et al, see previous paragraphs in this Office action.

JP 286740 ('740) teaches of essentially the same method and apparatus for judging a transformed state of bioactivity in substances such as cells as does JP '296 described in previous paragraphs. However, JP '740 additionally teaches that the method can be applied to the

Art Unit: 1743

development of anti-cancer agents, antibiotics and anti-virus agents. JP '740 also fails to teach that the comparison of spectra between normal and malignant cells/agents can be performed at more than one frequency or wave number.

However, based upon a combination of JP '740 and either Cohenford et al, Oong et al or Wong et al, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to compare the spectra taught by JP '740 between normal and malignant cells/agents at more than one frequency or wave number since any one of Cohenford et al, Oong et al and Wong et al disclose that the infrared absorption spectra between normal cells and diseased cells differs from one another at multiple frequencies or wave numbers, thus giving multiple indications that a test sample of cells is either malignant or normal.

13. Claims 19-24, 31 and 33 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims since none of the prior art of record teaches or fairly suggests the limitations recited therein.

14. Claims 36-41 and 50-51 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims since none of the prior art of record teaches or fairly suggests the limitations recited therein.

15. Applicant's arguments filed May 1, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The previous objections to the disclosure made in the last Office action dated December 2, 2002 (paper no. 4) have been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments thereto. In

Art Unit: 1743

addition, the previous rejections of the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph have also been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments to the claims. However, new objections and rejections of the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph are made herein as set forth above and necessitated by amendment.

Applicant argues the rejections of the claims under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Cohenford et al, Oong et al, Wong et al and Zakim et al by stating that each of these references fail to teach of identifying specimens based on only two wave numbers, as the instant claims recite. Applicant argues that these references merely recognize that there are differences in the absorption spectrum from one sample to the next. In response to this argument, it is noted that the instant claims recite the comparison of spectra between normal and diseased specimens at "at least two wave numbers" which means two or more. Each of the references applied against the claims under 35 USC 102 teach of multiple differences between the appearance of spectra of normal and diseased cells at multiple wave numbers, i.e. two or more. Therefore, these references anticipate the instant claims as presently written.

Applicant argues the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 103 by stating that both JP documents applied against the claims fail to teach of comparing the spectra of normal and diseased specimens at two or more wave numbers, and that the secondary references to Cohenford et al, Oong et al and Wong et al fail to teach or suggest the use of two specific wave numbers to characterize a given disease or compound. In response to this argument, it is noted that both JP references do fail to specifically teach of comparing the spectra of normal and diseased specimens at two or more specific wave numbers. However, JP '296 teaches that a plurality of spectra are regarded to be a malignant index, and that the wave number of 1261.4

Art Unit: 1743

cm⁻¹ is only one example of a characteristic spectrum in the infrared range in which differences occur between normal and malignant samples. See the middle paragraph on page 4 of the translation of JP '296. Therefore, JP '296 provides the suggestion of comparing spectra of normal and diseased specimens at two or more wave numbers. In addition, as stated earlier, some of the instant claims recite "at least two wave numbers", and do not specify which two specific wave numbers are used to characterize a specific disease or drug. Each of Cohenford et al, Oong et al and Wong et al teach of multiple differences between the appearance of spectra of normal and diseased cells at multiple wave numbers, i.e. two or more. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine another wave number, such as those recited in the instant claims, to compare between normal and diseased specimens analyzed with the method taught by JP '296 in addition to 1261.4 cm⁻¹, since all of Cohenford et al, Oong et al and Wong et al disclose multiple other wave numbers at which normal and diseased specimens differ, and routine experimentation can be used to observe the wave numbers where differences occur.

Applicant also argues that no motivation or objective evidence has been provided by the Examiner to support a prima facie case of obviousness. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the primary JP references provide the

Art Unit: 1743

teaching of measuring and comparing the absorption spectra of both normal and diseased specimens, and observing where in the spectra differences occur. JP '296 teaches that a plurality of spectra are regarded to be a malignant index, and that the wave number of 1261.4 cm^{-1} is only one example of a characteristic spectrum in the infrared range in which differences occur between normal and malignant samples. See the middle paragraph on page 4 of the translation of JP '296. Therefore, JP '296 provides the suggestion of comparing spectra of normal and diseased specimens at two or more wave numbers, but only provides one example of the wave number 1261.4 cm^{-1} . All of the secondary references to Cohenford et al, Oong et al and Wong et al provide the motivation to compare the absorption spectra of normal and diseased cells at more than one wave number since these references teach that the spectra between normal and diseased cells differ at more than one wave number. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine another wave number, such as those recited in the instant claims, to compare between normal and diseased specimens analyzed with the method taught by JP '296 in addition to 1261.4 cm^{-1} since all of Cohenford et al, Oong et al and Wong et al disclose multiple other wave numbers at which normal and diseased specimens differ, and routine experimentation can be used to observe the wave numbers where differences occur. In addition, page 13 of the instant specification states that the IR spectra specific to cancer cells are not limited to the wave numbers described in the specification and claims. Therefore, the wave numbers at which the spectra between normal and diseased cells differ taught by Cohenford et al, Oong et al and Wong et al are included within the scope of the instant invention.

For all of the above reasons, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1743

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 1743

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maureen M. Wallenhorst whose telephone number is 703-308-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Wednesday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden, can be reached on (703) 308-4037. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Maureen M. Wallenhorst
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1743

mmw

July 2, 2003

Maureen M. Wallenhorst
MAUREEN M. WALLENHORST
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP ~~1743~~ 1700